

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the specification, the three paragraphs on page 3, lines 2 to 23, have been amended to enhance the grammatical form of the disclosure to more closely correspond to the disclosure appearing in the Description of the Preferred Embodiments, beginning on page 4, line 17, to page 5, line 24, and to correspond with the disclosure of FIGS. 2-6. No new matter has been added.

The first full paragraph on page 6, lines 10-13, has been amended to delete the reference to FIG. 6.

Two new paragraphs have been added to the specification, on page 9, beginning as line 17, to add the text of the abstract as part of the specification. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claims 2, 4-5, and 7 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3 and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice. The applicant has not abandoned the subject matter of claims 1, 3 and 6, and the applicant reserves the right to file a continuation application directed thereto.

Although not cited by the Examiner, the applicant has corrected an obvious error in the preamble of claims 4, 5 and 7, by amending the preamble of claims 4, 5 and 7 to read: --The portable wireless unit of claim 2,-- rather than the "The portable wiring machine of claim 1,". The preambles of claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 now agree with the preamble of now cancelled claim 1. No new matter has been added.

Claim 2 has been rewritten into independent form which includes limitations from cancelled claims 1, 3 and 6. Support for the amendments to claim 2 is found in the

09/800,538

Amdt. Dated June 14, 2004

Reply to Office Action of March 11, 2004

specification beginning on page 4, line 17, to page 5, line 24, and in FIGS. 2 and 3.

Correspondingly, the dependency of remaining claims 4, 5 and 7 has been changed from cancelled claim 1 to now independent claim 2. No new matter has been added.

**35 U.S.C. 102(a) Rejections: Claims 1-4 and 6-7**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Arai et al* (The General Meeting of Institute of Electronics and Communications Engineers of Japan, SB-1-12 (1999), "Structure Method of Unidirectional Antenna for Portable Terminal and Phantom Effect of Human Body", pages 652-653).

The Examiner alleges that *Arai et al*, FIGS. 1-2, page 653, discloses the limitations of claim 1. The Examiner asserts also that *Arai et al* disclose the limitations of claims 2-4 and 6-7.

In response, the applicant calls to the Examiner's attention that claims 1, 3 and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

Claim 2 recites the limitations of a portable wireless unit comprising: a first plane antenna, disposed on a circuit board incorporated within a casing of the wireless unit, for receiving a current for excitation thereof, the first plane antenna having a single resonant frequency and a smaller size than a size associated with a desired frequency; and a parasitic second plane antenna, provided on an outer surface or inner surface of said casing, for presenting, when coupled together with said first plane antenna, an antenna size associated with said desired frequency.

Therefore, in the present invention of claim 2, the first plane antenna has a single resonant frequency. The size of the first plane antenna corresponds to the antenna size for providing a frequency higher than the desired frequency. The size of the parasitic second

antenna is set to provide the (single) desired frequency when used simultaneously with the first antenna.

As mentioned in the specification beginning on page 2, line 28, to page 3, line 1, the object of the present invention is to provide a portable wireless unit capable of enhancing the antenna characteristics, while reducing the occupied area of the case. That is, the portable wireless unit of claim 2 is capable of at least offsetting the lowering of radiation efficiency caused by reduced antenna area in the casing.

With respect to the Arai et al reference, the applicant maintains that the main purpose of Arai et al is to obtain a two-resonance characteristic and to improve the directive gain. To realize these aims, the sizes of the chip-size antenna and the parasitic element are chosen so that the desired two-resonance characteristic is obtained.

In contrast to the present invention of claim 2, in Section 2, lines 7-8, of Arai et al, it is stated that an inverted F type antenna is not used since the directive gain cannot be improved. This clearly teaches away from the present invention. The Examiner's attention should also be drawn to the present application, page 2, lines 18-26, and to, as originally filed, page 5, line 26, to page 6, line 10, where the differences between the present invention and systems such as that described in Arai et al are discussed.

Accordingly, the present invention of claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. In that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the prior art, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 4 and 7 over the prior art.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection: Claim 5**

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arai et al* (The General Meeting of Institute of Electronics and

09/800,538

Amdt. Dated June 14, 2004

Reply to Office Action of March 11, 2004

Communications Engineers of Japan, SB-1-12 (1999), "Structure Method of Unidirectional Antenna for Portable Terminal and Phantom Effect of Human Body", pages 652-653).

In response, in that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for the reasons cited in the foregoing discussion, the applicant maintains that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the prior art as well. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 5 over the prior art.

Reconsideration of this application based on the foregoing amendment and remarks is requested. The foregoing amendment and remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims remaining in the application, i.e., claims 2, 4, 5 and 7. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony N. Fresco.

Registration No.: 45,784

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343/4366 FAX  
ANF:nis